arXiv:hep-th/0011033v4 4 Mar 2001

OHSTPY-HEP-T-00-025

Sigma model approach to string theory effective actions with tachyons

A.A. Tseytlin[⋆][†]

Department of Physics
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210-1106, USA

Abstract

Motivated by recent discussions of actions for tachyon and vector fields related to tachyon condensation in open string theory we review and clarify some aspects of their derivation within sigma model approach. In particular, we demonstrate that the renormalized partition function $Z(T,A)$ of boundary sigma model gives the effective action for massless vectors which is consistent with string S-matrix and beta function, resolving an old problem with this suggestion in bosonic string case at the level of the leading $F^2(dF)^2$ derivative corrections to Born-Infeld action. We give manifestly gauge invariant definition of $Z(T,A)$ in non-abelian NSR open string theory and check that its derivative reproduces the tachyon beta function in a particular scheme. We also discuss derivation of similar actions for tachyon and massless modes in closed bosonic and NSR (type 0) string theories.

November 2000

[⋆] e-mail address: tseytlin@mps.ohio-state.edu

[†] Also at Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London and Lebedev Physics Institute, Moscow.

1. Introduction

To try to address the question of vacuum structure of string theory it is natural to look for a kind of field theory action which would interpolate between possible ground states, e.g., unstable perturbative and some stable non-perturbative one. The original S-matrix based method [1] of reconstructing string effective action order by order in powers of fields from on-shell scattering amplitudes does not in principle allow one to find such an action.

It was suggested in [2] that a useful framework for an off-shell approach should be a generalized 2-d sigma model partition function representing a generating functional [3] for correlators of string vertex operators given by the Polyakov path integral [4]. The condensates of string fields are then sigma model couplings, and one may hope to determine the exact structure of the action without expanding in powers of them (e.g., expanding instead in derivatives of the fields). One advantage of this sigma model approach is that off-shell gauge symmetries of low-energy expansions become manifest.

The precise definition of the effective action (see [5] for a review) should be consistent with the string S-matrix near the perturbative vacuum and should also reproduce the conditions of Weyl invariance of the sigma model as its equations of motion [6,7,8,9,10]. In critical string theory, where, by definition, one does not integrate over the conformal factor of the 2-d metric, the form of the off-shell action depends on a Weyl symmetry gauge, but that dependence should disappear at the stationary points described by 2-d conformal theories.

While this sigma model partition function approach was successful for the massless string modes leading to covariant expressions to all orders in powers of gravitons and dilatons in the closed string case and the vector field strength in the open string case [11], it produced unfamiliar expressions when applied to the tachyon field T. As was observed already in [2], the expression for the partition function $Z[T]$ computed by expanding in derivatives of T has the following structure in the critical bosonic string theory (both in the closed string case on 2-sphere and open string case on the disc): $Z = a_0 \int d^D x\, e^{-T} [1 + a_1 \alpha' \partial^2 T + O(\alpha'^2)]$. [For the closed string case this expression is given in eqs. (39),(40) in [2]. In the critical open string theory case one is to omit an additional integral over the length of the boundary in the expression following eq. (54) in [2].] The constant a_1 was renormalization scheme dependent (logarithmically divergent before subtraction). Introducing $\Phi = e^{-T/2}$ and properly tuning a_1 one was able to reproduce the standard tachyon kinetic term. The meaning of that procedure was, however, unclear.

Indeed, to be able to make connection with the standard tachyonic amplitudes it was obvious that one should expand in powers of T and not derivatives of T as the tachyon momentum should be close to its mass shell value. The corresponding tachyon beta-function then receives contributions which are non-perturbative in α' [6,12,13] and which are in agreement with the tachyonic terms in the effective action reconstructed directly from string amplitudes. The form of the "tachyon potential", i.e. the zero-momentum part of such action is inherently ambiguous [14,13], as one can always "dress" any factor of T by ∂^2 without changing on-shell amplitudes. Thus one needs some extra principle, not apparent at the level of string S-matrix, to fix this ambiguity.

One could still hope that such extra input was, in fact, contained in the world-sheet sigma model approach. This was effectively vindicated by the recent derivations of the tachyon potential in the open string theory (which were motivated by the study of tachyon condensation on non-BPS D-branes [15,16,17,18]; for some early studies of tachyon condensation see [19]): $e^{-T}(1+T)$ in the bosonic string case [20,21] and e^{-T^2} in the NSR string case [22].

While the discussions in [20,21,22] were presented in the framework of Witten's background-independent open string field theory [23,24], their results can be obtained directly in the context of the sigma model approach as we shall review below.

The idea is to return back to the original boundary sigma model [2] containing only the tachyon and massless vector couplings. This model is renormalizable within the standard derivative (α') expansion, i.e. its set of couplings is closed under perturbative RG flow. While one will certainly need to resum the α' expansion to be able to reproduce correct interaction terms at the standard tachyon vacuum point $T=0$, the low-energy expansion (approximate in ∂T but exact in T) may be useful in order to reveal the existence of a new stationary point invisible in perturbation theory near $T=0$. The main point is that low-energy expansion near $T=$ const, not applicable near the standard perturbative vacuum, may be applicable near the new one. The hope is that the resulting action will interpolate between the perturbative and the non-trivial vacua.

The central role in the sigma model approach is played by the string sigma model partition function which is directly related to the generating functional $< e^{\varphi_a^{(in)} \cdot V_a} >$ for string acattering amplitudes. As was argued in [10,25], the tree level effective action $S[A]$ for the massless vector field should be given simply by the *renormalized* partition function of the boundary sigma model, as originally conjectured in [2]. Renormalization of logarithmic infinities corresponds to subtraction of massless poles [10,6,26], while elimination of power divergences by a shift of the bare tachyon coupling accounts for a contribution of the tachyon poles in the massless amplitudes. When consistently implemented, this renormalization procedure resolves (as we shall explain in Section 2.2 below) an apparent contradiction between $S[A] = Z[A]$ ansatz and string S-matrix found at the level of the $F^2(\partial F)^2$ terms in [27].

In the presence of a non-zero (renormalized) tachyon background the $S = Z$ prescription requires a modification in the case of *bosonic* string theory. Indeed, $Z' = \frac{\partial Z}{\partial T}$ does not vanish at the standard vacuum point $T = 0$, so one needs to make a subtraction of the derivative term $S[T] = Z[T] - T \cdot Z'[0] + \ldots$. A consistent modification of $S = Z$ satisfying $S[0] = 0$ was suggested in the context of the Witten's approach [23,24]: $\hat{S}[T] = Z[T] + \beta^T \cdot Z'[T]$, where β^T is the tachyon β-function. This form of subtraction term is a natural one since it preserves the property of RG invariance of the action. This definition then leads to the expression $e^{-T}(1 + T)$ for the open bosonic string tachyon potential [20]. We derive the corresponding low-energy effective action in Section 2.1 and also generalize it to the presence of a constant F_{mn} background.

The complication of power divergences and associated shift of the tachyon coupling is absent in the case of world-sheet supersymmetric NSR string. In particular, while in the bosonic string the tachyon couples linearly to the fields of the massless sector, it decouples from them in the NSR case (interaction terms are quadratic in T). Here the $S[A] = Z[A]$ prescription is manifestly consistent [27] and, moreover, should apply also to the case of a non-vanishing tachyon background [22]. We discuss the NSR case in detail in Section 3, reproducing some of the results of [22]. We also give a manifestly gauge invariant definition of the partition function in the general non-abelian case and demonstrate that the second-derivative part of the action $S[T] = Z[T]$ taken in a special scheme has its variation over T proportional to the linear perturbative terms in the tachyon β-function. As in the bosonic case, we generalize this action to the presence of constant F_{mn} background, when the potential term becomes $e^{-T^2}\sqrt{\det(I + F)}$.

One of the lessons of application of the sigma model approach to open string theory is that the "global" covariant objects defined by the sigma model path integral – partition function or effective action – may contain more information than a set of β-functions (or, more precisely, Weyl anomaly coefficients) computed in a local coordinate patch in field (sigma model coupling) space. Indeed, the information on a metric [8] on the coupling space is effectively encoded in Z. The effective action then may have additional stationary points not seen from the β-functions computed in a "standard" coordinate patch. This may happen if the field space metric κ becomes degenerate at these points when described in terms of "standard" coordinates. For example, the field space may have a non-trivial topology, and thus may need to be represented by several coordinate patches.

Since the sigma model partition function plays the central role in the open string case, leading to the correct expression for the tachyon potential, it is natural to expect that the same should be true also in the *closed* string case. In section 4 we apply the sigma model approach to discuss the tachyon dependence of the effective actions in *closed* bosonic and NSR string theories. In the closed string theory the effective action for the massless modes is determined by sigma model partition function on 2-sphere in the following way [28,29,5]: $S[\lambda] = -(\frac{\partial Z}{\partial \ln \epsilon})_{\epsilon=1} = \beta^i \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \lambda^i}$, so that $S = \int d^D x \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi} (\beta^\phi - \frac{1}{4} G^{mn} \beta^G_{mn}) = \int d^D x \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi} (D - 26 + ...)$. The extra derivative over the logarithm of 2-d cutoff (compared to the original $S = Z$ conjecture of [2]) accounts for the subtraction of the volume of the Möbius group which is lorathmically divergent in the 2-sphere case [28] (in both the bosonic and the fermionic string theories). We shall suggest that, like in the open string case, in the presence of a tachyon background this relation should again be modified by subtracting a term proportional to $\frac{\partial S}{\partial T}$ to satisfy the condition $\hat{S}[0] = 0$. The resulting tachyon potential is then $-T^2 e^{-T}$.

No such modification is necessary in the closed fermionic NSR (or type 0) string case, where we argue that (the NS-NS part of) the effective action depends on the tachyon field only through $(\partial T)^2$ and $\partial^2 T$, i.e. there appears to be no tachyon potential.

2. Open bosonic string

Let us first take a formal approach, forgetting about possible connection to on-shell string S-matrix and consider the partition function for the (Euclidean) boundary sigma model with two couplings $I = \int d\varphi [\frac{1}{\epsilon} T(x) + i A_m(x) \dot{x}^m]$. This theory is power counting renormalizable if one expands in powers of derivatives of T and A_m, i.e. is closed under RG with all higher-derivative non-renormalizable interactions (massive string modes) consistently decoupled. One can then ask which is the functional $S[T, A]$ (the boundary analog [30] of the c-function [8]) that reproduces the corresponding perturbative β-functions in the sense of $\frac{\partial S}{\partial \lambda^i} = \kappa_{ij}(\lambda) \beta^j$, $\lambda^i = (T, A_m)$. If we decouple the tachyon (solve for it in terms of A_m) the result should then be the effective action consistent with the S-matrix for the massless vector mode. More generally, such "effective action" functional $S[T, A]$ may represent a natural off-shell extension, capturing non-trivial behavior of string theory far away from standard tachyonic mass shell. Remarkably, this is indeed what happens to be true, as indicated by the discussions in [20,21].

It is useful to start by recalling the expression for the partition function (or the generating functional for tachyon and vector amplitudes in open string theory on the disc) in the general non-abelian case [2,11]

$$Z[T,A,\epsilon] =< \mathrm{tr} P \exp\Big(- \int d\varphi [\epsilon^{-1} T(x) + i A_m(x) \dot{x}^m] \Big) > \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where the averaging is done with the free string action in the bulk of the disc and $\varphi \in (0, 2\pi)$ parametrizes its boundary. Here T and A_m are Hermitian matrices in the Chan-Paton algebra of $U(N)$. We consider the oriented string case relevant in D-brane context and define the action so that continued to the Minkowski signature it becomes real. $\epsilon = \frac{a}{r} \to 0$ is a dimensionless UV cutoff, i.e. the ratio of the short-distance cutoff and the radius of the disc. $< ... >$ depends on ϵ through the propagator (see eq. (2.5) below). One can make (2.1) more explicit by using the well-known representation [31] of path ordered exponent in terms of the path integral over 1-d anticommuting fields $\eta^a, \bar{\eta}_b$ in the fundamental and antifundamental representations of $U(N)$

$$Z[T,A,\epsilon] =< \int [d\eta][d\bar{\eta}] \ \exp\Big(- \int d\varphi [\bar{\eta}_a \dot{\eta}^a + \bar{\eta}_a (\epsilon^{-1} T^a_{\ b}(x) + i A^a_{\ bm}(x) \dot{x}^m) \eta^b] \Big) > \ . \tag{2.2}$$

The measure of integration is assumed to contain the factor $\bar{\eta}_c(0)\eta^c(2\pi)$. In the abelian case (2.1) is simply

$$Z[T,A,\epsilon] =< e^{-\int d\varphi [\epsilon^{-1} T(x) + i A_m(x) \dot{x}^m]} > \ . \tag{2.3}$$

The standard procedure [2,11,25] to compute Z is to first isolate the constant ("zero mode") part of x^m and integrate over the internal points of the disc getting an effective 1-d path integral for the boundary theory

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x \ e^{-W} \ , \qquad e^{-W} =< e^{-I} >= \int [d\xi] \ e^{-\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int \xi G^{-1} \xi \ - I} \ , \tag{2.4}$$

$$G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-n\epsilon}}{n} \cos n\varphi_{12} \ , \qquad \varphi_{12} = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \ , \tag{2.5}$$

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big[\epsilon^{-1} (T + \tfrac{1}{2} \xi^m \xi^k \partial_m \partial_k T + \tfrac{1}{6} \xi^m \xi^k \xi^l \partial_m \partial_k \partial_l T + ...)$$

$$+\, i(\tfrac{1}{2}\xi^k F_{km} + \tfrac{1}{3}\xi^k \xi^l \partial_l F_{km} + \ldots)\dot{\xi}^m \Big] \ . \tag{2.6}$$

We have shifted $x(\varphi) \to x + \xi(\varphi)$, $\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \ \xi(\varphi) = 0$ (so that W contains contributions of 1-PI graphs only). In what follows we shall often set the inverse string tension $2\pi\alpha'$ to one, but the dependence on α' is easy to restore on dimensional grounds, $\partial^k T \to (\sqrt{2\pi\alpha'}\partial)^k T$, $\partial^k F_{mn} \to (\sqrt{2\pi\alpha'}\partial)^k (2\pi\alpha' F_{mn})$.

If one ignores all higher than second powers in ξ, i.e. assumes that $\partial_m\partial_n T$ and F_{mn} are constant, the resulting path integral becomes gaussian and can be computed explicitly, as was done for $T=0$ in [11] (see also [32]) and including $\partial_m\partial_n T$ in [33,34,35,36].

One may "resum" the perturbative expansion by including $F\xi\dot{\xi}$ term into the propagator [37]; regularizing the final expression one gets [25,27]

$$G^{mn}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2|F) = \ \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon n}}{n}\big[\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\cos n\varphi_{12} - i\mathcal{H}^{mn}(F)\sin n\varphi_{12}\big] \ , \tag{2.7}$$

$$\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F) \equiv [(I+F)^{-1}]^{(mn)} = [(I-F^2)^{-1}]^{mn} = \delta^{mn} + F^{mk}F^{kn} + \ldots \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{mn} \equiv -[(I+F)^{-1}]^{[mn]} = [F(I-F^2)^{-1}]^{mn} = F^{mk}\mathcal{G}^{kn} \ .$$

It is then straightforward to compute the leading terms in expansion of Z in derivatives of T and F but to all orders in F_{mn}.

The model (2.2),(2.3) is renormalizable in derivative (α') expansion, so that T and A_m in (2.2) or (2.3) should be interpreted as ϵ-dependent bare couplings which cancel all the divergent terms, i.e. [25]

$$Z[T(\epsilon), A(\epsilon), \epsilon] = Z_{\rm R}[T_{\rm R}, A_{\rm R}] \ , \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$T(\epsilon) = \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\epsilon\big[1 + h_1(A_{\rm R})\ln\epsilon + h_2(A_{\rm R})\ln^2\epsilon + \ldots\big]T_{\rm R} + \big[k_1(A_{\rm R}) + k_2(A_{\rm R})\ln\epsilon + \ldots.\big] \ , \tag{2.10}$$

$$A(\epsilon) = A_{\rm R} + f_1(A_{\rm R})\ln\epsilon + f_2(A_{\rm R})\ln^2\epsilon + \ldots \ . \tag{2.11}$$

Here the renormalized fields are defined at point $2\pi r$ and h_i contain differential operators acting on $T_{\rm R}$. For example, it is easy to show that in the abelian case and for constant F_{mn} background

$$h_1(A)T = \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\partial_m\partial_n T \ , \qquad [f_1(A)]_k = \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\partial_m F_{nk} \ . \tag{2.12}$$

f_1 represents the "Born-Infeld" β-function [37,38]. The inhomogeneous term in (2.10) [25]

$$k_1 = -\tfrac{1}{4\pi} \ln \det(\delta_{mn} + F_{mn}) = -\tfrac{1}{8\pi} F^2_{mn} + O(F^4) \ , \qquad (2.13)$$

corresponds to a shift of the bare tachyon needed to be done to absorb the F_{mn}-dependent linear divergence appearing in the computation of Z for F_{mn} = const leading to the BI action [11,25]

$$W = b_0 \ln \det(\delta_{mn} + F_{mn}) \ , \qquad b_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\epsilon n} = \tfrac{1}{2\epsilon} - \tfrac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon) \ . \qquad (2.14)$$

If one subtracts the term (2.13) from the beginning, it will not appear in the corresponding β^T-function. This is a scheme-dependent [39] property, as one can of course induce a similar term back by a field redefinition, $T \to T + f(F)$. [Similar inhomogeneous term does not appear in the tachyon β-function in the closed string case if one uses the natural scheme in which the general covariance of the theory is manifest [13].] This scheme is fixed by the requirement that the corresponding effective action with $T = 0$ and F_{mn} = const is given simply by the BI action (which itself is related, via D-brane action connection, to basic reparametrization symmetry of the underlying string theory). The subtraction of (2.13) to be done in the bare partition function will play an important role in Section 2.2 below.

The renormalized value of the partition function takes the form (here and in what follows we omit subscripts "R" on the renormalized value of Z and the fields)

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x \ e^{-T} \ \sqrt{\det(\delta_{mn} + F_{mn})} \Big[1 + a_1 \alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(F) \partial_m \partial_n T$$

$$+ \mathcal{F}^{kmnacd}(F) \partial_k F_{mn} \partial_a F_{cd} + O(\partial^4 T, \partial^4 F^k) \Big] \ , \qquad (2.15)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{kmnacd}(F) \sim F^2 + F^4 + \ldots$ [27] and $\alpha' = \frac{1}{2\pi}$ (i.e. $2\pi\alpha' = 1$).

The coefficient a_1 is logarithmically divergent before renormalization ($\pi G(\varphi, \varphi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} e^{-\epsilon n} = -\ln \epsilon + O(\epsilon)$) and thus is scheme dependent, i.e. its value can be changed by a field redefinition [39,25].

2.1. Tachyon action

Let us first set $F_{mn} = 0$ and consider the dependence of Z (2.15) on T

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x\ e^{-T}\ (1 + a_1 \alpha' \partial^2 T + ...) = a_0 \int d^D x\ e^{-T}\ [1 + a_1 \alpha' (\partial T)^2 + ...] \ , \qquad (2.16)$$

i.e.

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x\ [\ \Phi^2 + 4 a_1 \alpha' (\partial \Phi)^2 + ...] \ , \qquad \Phi \equiv e^{-T/2} \ . \qquad (2.17)$$

This expression which looks like an action for a massive field with $m^2 = (4a_1\alpha')^{-1}$ was first found in [2]. However, its derivative does not vanish for $T = 0$, i.e. does not reproduce the perturbative tachyon coupling β-function which is given, to all orders in the α' expansion, simply by (cf. (2.12))

$$\beta^T = -T - \alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(F) \partial_m \partial_n T = -T - \alpha' \partial^2 T + O(F \partial\partial T) \ . \qquad (2.18)$$

This suggests that in the *bosonic* open string theory, the definition of the effective action as the renormalized sigma model partition function Z [2,25] needs a modification when the tachyon background is non-zero. The required refinement of the $S = Z$ relation was suggested in [23,24]: to define an action functional which will be stationary at conformal points one is to add an extra derivative term

$$\hat{S} = S + \beta^T \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta T} S = Z + \beta^T \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta T} Z \ . \qquad (2.19)$$

The second subtraction term is a natural one as it preserves the property of RG invariance of the action. Note that $\hat{S}$ and Z are equal at the stationary points of $\hat{S}$. Also,

$$\hat{S}[T] = S[T + \beta^T] + O((\beta^T)^2) \ = \ e^{\beta^T \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta T}}\ Z[T] + O((\beta^T)^2) \ , \qquad (2.20)$$

i.e. changing from $S = Z$ to $\hat{S}$ may look like a field redefinition of T. This redefinition is, however, singular in the case of the tachyon coupling.

In general, if for a set of fields (sigma model couplings) λ^i which is closed under the RG one has [23,24]

$$\hat{S} = Z + \beta^i \partial_i Z \ , \qquad \partial_i \hat{S} = \kappa_{ij} \beta^j \ , \qquad (2.21)$$

then

$$\partial_i \hat{S} = \partial_i Z + \partial_i \beta^j \partial_j Z + \beta^j \partial_i \partial_j Z \ , \qquad (2.22)$$

$$(\kappa_{ij} - \partial_i \partial_j Z) \beta^j = (\delta_i^j + \partial_i \beta^j) \partial_j Z \ , \qquad (2.23)$$

so that $\partial_j Z = 0$ may not imply $\beta^j = 0$ if the "shifted" matrix of anomalous dimensions $\delta_i^j + \partial_i \beta^j$ is degenerate in some limit (e.g. at low momenta). This is precisely what happens in the tachyon field case (cf. (2.18)), so that the modification (2.19) is important here.

Using (2.16),(2.18) we find that (2.19) is given, to the leading order in derivatives of T, by (cf. [20,21])

$$\hat{S} = a_0 \int d^D x \; e^{-T} \left[1 + T + (1 - a_1)\alpha' (\partial T)^2 + a_1 \alpha' T (\partial T)^2 + O(\partial^4 T) \right] . \tag{2.24}$$

Choosing a *special* scheme where

$$a_1 = \tfrac{1}{2} \ , \tag{2.25}$$

one finally gets

$$\hat{S} = a_0 \int d^D x \; e^{-T} \left[(1 + T)(1 + \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' \partial^m T \partial_m T) + O(\partial^4 T) \right] . \tag{2.26}$$

Then

$$\frac{\delta \hat{S}}{\delta T} = \ a_0 \; e^{-T} \; [-T - \alpha' \partial^2 T - \alpha' T \partial^2 T + \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' T (\partial T)^2 + O(\alpha'^2 \partial^4 T)] \ , \tag{2.27}$$

which is indeed proportional to the β^T-function (2.18) to the leading order in T [20,21]. Here e^{-T} should be interpreted as the field space metric $\kappa_{TT}(T)$ in (2.21) and the non-linear terms in T should be redefinable away (within α' or derivative expansion (2.18) should be the exact expression for the β^T-function). Eq. (2.27) has two obvious zeros: $T = 0$ and $T = \infty$ with the second one related to the tachyon condensation [16,21]. Another solution $T(x) = a + ux^2$ with finite constants a, u [21] is an artifact of α' expansion (it does not correspond to a conformal 2-d theory). [$T = ux_a^2$ with $u \to \infty$ which is a stationary point of $\hat{S}$ but does not directly solve $\beta^T = 0$ in (2.18) does define a CFT since it corresponds to $\delta(x_a)$, i.e. Dirichlet boundary conditions in x_a direction.]

Including F_{mn} =const background we get the following generalization of (2.15),(2.24)

$$\hat{S} = a_0 \int d^D x \; e^{-T} \; \sqrt{\det(\delta_{mn} + F_{mn})} \left[1 + T + \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(F) \partial_m \partial_n T + ... \right] , \tag{2.28}$$

or

$$\hat{S} = a_0 \int d^D x \; e^{-T} \; \sqrt{\det(\delta_{mn} + 2\pi\alpha' F_{mn})} \Big[(1 + T)[1 + \ \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(2\pi\alpha' F) \ \partial_m T \partial_n T]$$

$$+ O(\alpha'^2 \partial^4 T, \alpha'^2 \partial^2 F) \Big] \ , \qquad (2.29)$$

where we restored the full dependence on α'. The variation of this action is proportional the β^T-function (2.18) with $\partial^2 T$ replaced by $\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\partial_m \partial_n T$ (in agreement with (2.12)) and which does not contain the inhomogeneous term (2.13).

One may raise the question of why the action (2.29) is consistent with the string S-matrix which contains a non-vanishing tachyon-vector-vector amplitude. The latter can be reproduced by the TF^2_{mn} term in the effective action but such term is not present in (2.29). However, the term $-\alpha' F^2_{mn} \partial^2 T$ (or $-2\alpha' T \partial_k F_{mn} \partial_k F_{mn}$) leads to the same on-shell 3-point amplitude since for the on shell tachyon $\alpha' \partial^2 T = -T$. Such higher derivative term is indeed present in (2.28) or (2.29). The corresponding $\partial_k F_{mn} \partial_k F_{mn}$ term in (2.27) or in the tachyon β-function is not visible in the α' expansion but can be reproduced if one expands in powers of the fields instead of powers of derivatives and sums all orders in α' (see [12]). Let us note that this case is completely analogous to the RT vs. $R^2_{mnkl}T$ contribution (giving the same on-shell graviton-graviton-tachyon amplitude) in the closed string effective action discussed in [13].

2.2. Vector field action

Let us now set T to zero and consider the dependence of Z on the vector field A_m. In view of the arguments given in [10,25,27] the effective action $S[A]$ which reproduces the string S-matrix and is also consistent with the expression for the vector field β^A-function in the boundary sigma model should be given simply by the *renormalized* value of the sigma model partition function

$$S[A_{\rm R}] = Z_{\rm R}[A_{\rm R}, T_{\rm R} = 0] \ . \qquad (2.30)$$

We shall again omit subscripts "R" below.

This relation passes a number of non-trivial tests. In the abelian case, for $F_{mn} = {\rm const}$ one finds that Z is equal to the BI action [11] whose derivative over A_m is indeed to be proportional to the leading one-loop term $-\alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\partial_m F_{nk}$ in the β^A-function [37]. The F^4 term in the expansion of the BI action is also in agreement with the string 4-point amplitude [10,40]. In the non-abelian case, the direct computation of $Z(A)$ defined by (2.3) gives, after a renormalization, [25]

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x \ {\rm tr} \Big[1 - (2\pi\alpha')^2 [\tfrac{1}{4} F^2_{mn} + \tfrac{2}{3}\alpha' F_{mn} F_{nk} F_{km} + d_1 \alpha' (D_m F_{mn})^2] + O(\alpha'^4) \Big] \ , \qquad (2.31)$$

where d_1 is scheme-dependent. This coincides with the non-abelian $F^2 + F^3$ terms in the action reconstructed from the bosonic string S-matrix [1,10].

There was, however, a problem with $S = Z$ ansatz (2.30) in the *bosonic* string case pointed out in [27]. The direct computation of the leading derivative ∂F dependent terms in the abelian partition function (2.3) gave the following expression ($2\pi\alpha' = 1$) [27]

$$Z = a_0 \int d^D x \Big[1 + \tfrac{1}{4} F^2_{mn} - \tfrac{1}{8} [(F_{mk}F_{kn})^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}(F^2_{mn})^2]$$

$$+ b_1 F_{kl}F_{kl}\partial_a F_{mn}\partial_a F_{mn} + b_2 F_{kl}F_{lm}\partial_a F_{mn}\partial_a F_{nk} + b_3 F_{la}F_{lb}\partial_a F_{mn}\partial_b F_{mn} + O(\partial^2 F^6) \Big] , \tag{2.32}$$

where

$$b_1 = \frac{1}{24\pi} \ , \quad b_2 = -\frac{1}{6\pi} \ , \quad b_3 = \frac{1}{12\pi} \ , \tag{2.33}$$

and we have ignored all terms which have scheme-dependent coefficients (i.e. vanish on $\partial_m F_{mn} = 0$). At the same time, both the string 4-point amplitude [27] and the 2-loop sigma model β^A-function calculation [41] led to the action (2.32) with the coefficients

$$b_1 = -\frac{1}{48\pi} \ , \quad b_2 = -\frac{1}{6\pi} \ , \quad b_3 = \frac{1}{12\pi} \ , \tag{2.34}$$

i.e. with the *same* b_2 and b_3 but with b_1 differing by factor $-\frac{1}{2}$. This apparent disagreement of the $S = Z$ ansatz with the S-matrix and the β^A-function was attributed in [27] to the presence of the tachyon in the bosonic string. The tachyon poles are formally expanded in momenta in the derivation of the massless field effective action from the string S-matrix, and it was suggested that the corresponding subtraction of power divergences in Z may be hard to implement unambiguously.

This problem has, in fact, a very simple resolution implied by the definition (2.30): a particular "tachyon-related" $F^2\partial F\partial F$ term was missed in [27] since the tachyon field there was set equal to zero *before* properly subtracting the linearly divergent F-dependent term (2.13). This subtraction effectively accounts for the contribution coming from the expansion of the tachyonic pole in the 4-vector amplitude which is included in the effective action if it is reconstructed from the S-matrix. Once this extra term is added, the agreement between $S[A]$ and $Z[A]$ is indeed restored!

As was stressed above, the effective action should be given by the *renormalized* value of $Z[A]$. The bare partition function has the same structure as (2.15) (with $T \equiv T_{\rm R} \to \frac{2\pi}{\epsilon} T$) but in addition it contains the linearly divergent term in the exponent $e^{\frac{2\pi}{\epsilon} k_1}$ (see

(2.14),(2.13)). Shifting the bare tachyon (2.10) to absorb this linear divergence (and then setting $T_{\rm R}=0$) introduces extra ∂F-dependent terms effectively originating from the $\partial^2 T$ term in (2.15). Explicitly, applying the *same* computational scheme (ϵ-regularization in (2.5) plus minimal subtraction) that was used in the original computation of (2.32),(2.33) in [27] one finds the following expression for $Z(T,A)$ in (2.4),(2.5) (in the form described below this computation was done by O. Andreev; it corrects the original version of this argument)

$$Z=\int d^Dx\, e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\epsilon}T}\left[1+k_1(\epsilon)\partial^2 T+k_2(\epsilon)F^2_{mn}+k_3(\epsilon)F^2_{mn}\partial^2 T+k_4(\epsilon)F^{km}F^{kn}\partial_m\partial_n T+O(\partial^4)\right] , \tag{2.35}$$

where $2\pi\alpha'=1$ and

$$k_1=-\epsilon^{-1}I_1(\epsilon) , \quad k_2=-\tfrac{1}{2}I_0(2\epsilon) , \quad k_3=\tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1}I_0(2\epsilon)I_1(\epsilon) , \quad k_4=\epsilon^{-1}I_1(3\epsilon) , \tag{2.36}$$

and

$$I_0(\epsilon)\equiv\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-\epsilon n}=(e^{\epsilon}-1)^{-1}=\tfrac{1}{\epsilon}-\tfrac{1}{2}+\tfrac{\epsilon}{12}+O(\epsilon^2) , \tag{2.37}$$

$$I_1(\epsilon)\equiv\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n}e^{-\epsilon n}=-\ln(1-e^{-\epsilon})=-\ln\epsilon+\tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon+O(\epsilon^2) . \tag{2.38}$$

To cancel the leading power divergences in the F^2_{mn} and $F^2_{mn}\partial^2 T$ terms one is to shift $T\to T-\frac{1}{8\pi}F^2_{mn}$ in the exponent. Using the *minimal* subtraction to absorb the singular logarithmic parts of the coefficients k_i into the bare couplings T and A_m one is left with the following values for their finite ($\epsilon\to 0$) parts: $(k_2)_{\rm fin}=\frac{1}{4}$, $(k_3)_{\rm fin}=-\frac{1}{8}$, $(k_4)_{\rm fin}=\frac{3}{2}$. The additional $F^2\partial\partial F^2$ terms coming from (2.35) that should be added to (2.32) are then

$$\Delta Z=a_0\int d^Dx\ (\tfrac{1}{16\pi})\left[\tfrac{1}{4}F^2_{kl}\partial^2(F^2_{mn})-3F^2_{pq}\partial_m\partial_n(F_{mk}F_{nk})\right] . \tag{2.39}$$

Using $\partial_{[k}F_{mn]}=0$ and dropping terms proportional to the equations of motion so that $\partial_n F_{mk}\partial_m F_{nk}=\frac{1}{2}\partial_k F_{mn}\partial_k F_{mn}+O(\partial_m F_{mn})$, we find

$$\Delta Z=a_0\int d^Dx\ (-\tfrac{1}{16\pi})F_{pq}F_{pq}\partial_k F_{mn}\partial_k F_{mn} . \tag{2.40}$$

Thus this "tachyonic" correction contributes only to the coefficient of the first $F^2\partial F\partial F$ term in (2.32)

$$b_1\ \to\ b_1-\frac{1}{16\pi} , \tag{2.41}$$

changing it precisely into the b_1 in (2.34). This implies the *equivalence* of the leading ∂F derivative terms in the effective actions obtained (i) from the partition function, (ii) from the string S-matrix, and (iii) from the β^A-function.

3. Open NSR string

Ignoring first the tachyon, the analog of the partition function (2.3),(2.4) which is the generating functional for massless vector scattering amplitudes is given by [10,42,27]

$$Z(A) =< \text{tr } P\exp\Big(- i\int d\varphi \ [\dot{x}^m A_m(x) - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn}(x)]\Big) >$$

$$= \int d^Dx < \text{tr } P\exp\Big(- i\int d\varphi \ [\dot{\xi}^m A_m(x+\xi) - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn}(x+\xi)]\Big) > , \qquad (3.1)$$

where the averaging is done with the free string propagator restricted to the boundary of the disc, i.e. with the effective 1-d boundary action $I_0 = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\int(\xi G^{-1}\xi + \psi K^{-1}\psi)$ with periodic $\xi^m(\varphi)$ and antiperiodic $\psi^m(\varphi)$. The bosonic Green function in (2.5) is now supplemented by the fermionic one

$$G(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-n\epsilon}}{n}\cos n\varphi_{12} \ , \qquad K(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty} e^{-r\epsilon}\sin r\varphi_{12} \ . \qquad (3.2)$$

As discussed in [27], the $\epsilon \to +0$ regularization preserves underlying 1-d supersymmetry (which is spontaneously broken by the antiperiodic boundary condition on ψ^m, i.e. is an "asymptotic" symmetry).

P in (3.1) stands for the standard path ordering. The contact $[A_m, A_n]$ term in F_{mn} implying manifest non-abelian gauge invariance of the resulting amplitudes can be derived [42,27] from the contact terms in the supersymmetric theta-functions in the manifestly 1-d supersymmetric definition of the path ordering (see also below).

To include the tachyon field, one may start with the standard NS [43] vertex operator $\int d\varphi \ \psi^m\partial_m T(x)$. This coupling cannot, however, be added directly into the exponent in (3.1) as ψ is Grassmann while T is not (integrating ψ^m out would leave no dependence on T). To get a non-zero answer for the correlators one is to properly order the interaction vertices. A simple way to do that, as suggested in [44] and elaborated on in [16,22], is to introduce a non-dynamical 1-d anticommuting, real, antiperiodic field $\zeta(\varphi)$, and to add to the action the following terms $\int d\varphi[\zeta\dot{\zeta} + i\zeta\psi^m\partial_m T(x)]$.

3.1. General non-abelian case

More precisely, to automatically include the contact terms which will make the non-abelian gauge invariance explicit, one is to insist on manifest world-sheet supersymmetry of the sigma model interaction terms [45,42,27]. As in [46,27] here this is accomplished by replacing x^m by the 1-d scalar superfields $\hat{x}^m = x^m + \theta\psi^m$, and the $U(N)$ "quarks" $\eta^a, \bar\eta_a$ in (2.2) and the new variable ζ by the "spinor" superfields $\hat\eta^a = \eta^a + \theta\chi^a$, $\hat{\bar\eta}_a = \bar\eta_a + \theta\bar\chi_a$ and $\hat\zeta = \zeta + \theta f$. This ensures the 1-d supersymmetry of the path ordering [42,27]. The resulting partition function is given by the path integral over $\hat{x}^m, \hat\eta, \hat{\bar\eta}, \hat\zeta$ similar to (2.2) with the interaction part of the action now being

$$I = -\int d\varphi d\theta \Big(\hat{\bar\eta} D\hat\eta + \hat\zeta D\hat\zeta + i\hat{\bar\eta}\big[\, \hat\zeta\ \mathcal{T}(\hat{x}) + A_m(\hat{x}) D\hat{x}^m\big]\hat\eta \Big) \ , \tag{3.3}$$

where $D \equiv \theta\partial_\varphi - \partial_\theta$ and we suppressed the $U(N)$ indices on $\hat\eta^a, \hat{\bar\eta}_a$ and the fields $\mathcal{T}^a_b$, $A^a{}_{bm}$. Here $\mathcal{T}$ is the bare tachyon, i.e. $\mathcal{T} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} T$.

The component form of (3.3) is

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big[\bar\eta\dot\eta + \zeta\dot\zeta + f^2 + \bar\chi\chi + i\bar\eta(\mathcal{T}\zeta + A_m\psi^m)\chi - i\bar\chi(\mathcal{T}\zeta - A_m\psi^m)\eta$$

$$+ i\bar\eta[f\mathcal{T} - \zeta\psi^m\partial_m\mathcal{T} + (A_m\dot{x}^m - \psi^m\psi^n\partial_m A_n)]\eta \Big] \ . \tag{3.4}$$

This action is manifestly 1-d supersymmetric, but its non-abelian gauge invariance becomes apparent only after integrating over the auxiliary fields $\chi, \bar\chi$

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big[\bar\eta\dot\eta + \zeta\dot\zeta + f^2 + i\bar\eta[f\mathcal{T} - \zeta\psi^m \mathrm{D}_m\mathcal{T} + (A_m\dot{x}^m - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn})]\eta \Big] \ , \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\mathrm{D}_m\mathcal{T} = \partial_m\mathcal{T} + i[A_m, \mathcal{T}] \ , \qquad F_{mn} = \partial_m A_n - \partial_n A_m + i[A_m, A_n] \ .$$

Integration over the auxiliary field f gives

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big[\bar\eta\dot\eta + \zeta\dot\zeta + \tfrac{1}{4}(\bar\eta\mathcal{T}\eta)^2 + i\bar\eta[-\zeta\psi^m \mathrm{D}_m\mathcal{T} + (A_m\dot{x}^m - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn})]\eta \Big] \ . \tag{3.6}$$

Finally, integrating over ζ we find

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big[\bar\eta\dot\eta + \tfrac{1}{4}(\bar\eta\mathcal{T}\eta)^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}(\psi^m\bar\eta \mathrm{D}_m\mathcal{T}\eta)\partial_\varphi^{-1}(\psi^n\bar\eta D_n\mathcal{T}\eta)$$

$$+ i\bar{\eta}(A_m \dot{x}^m - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn})\eta \Big] \ . \tag{3.7}$$

Here (cf. (3.2))

$$\partial_\varphi^{-1}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r}\sin r\varphi_{12} \ . \tag{3.8}$$

Note that the δ-function defined on antiperiodic functions is $\delta^{(-)}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty}\cos r\varphi_{12}$ so that (ignoring regularization, cf. [27]) $K\cdot K = -\delta^{(-)}$ and $\partial_\varphi \cdot \partial_\varphi^{-1} = \delta^{(-)}$, $\partial_{\varphi_1}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) \equiv \partial_{\varphi_1}\delta^{(-)}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty} r\sin r\varphi_{12}$. One could think of using the regularized expression $\partial_\varphi^{-1}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-r\epsilon}}{r}\sin r\varphi_{12}$, but that leads to complicated expressions as it should be accompaneed by a similar regularization in the f^2 term to preserve 1-d supersymmetry.

The resulting derivative expansion of Z is thus expressed in terms of $\mathcal{T}, F_{mn}$ and their covariant derivatives.

In the abelian $U(1)$ case the integral over $\eta, \bar{\eta}$ in (3.5) is trivial and the tachyonic part of (3.7) becomes equivalent to the terms originally derived in [16,22] (cf. (2.3))

$$I = \int d\varphi \Big(\tfrac{1}{4}\mathcal{T}^2(x) - \tfrac{1}{4}[\psi^m\partial_m\mathcal{T}(x)]\partial_\varphi^{-1}[\psi^n\partial_n\mathcal{T}(x)] + i[A_m(x)\dot{x}^m - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi^m\psi^n F_{mn}(x)] \Big) \ . \tag{3.9}$$

It is easy to check directly that this action is invariant under 1-d supersymmetry $\delta x^m = \psi^m\varepsilon$, $\delta\psi^m = \partial_\varphi x^m \varepsilon$. Note that if $\mathcal{T}$ is a constant non-abelian matrix then the path ordering (the integral over η in (3.5)) is not relevant, and integrating over f one gets the potential factor tr $e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\mathcal{T}^2}$ [22]. In general, however, the non-abelian generalization of (3.9) consistent with 1-d supersymmetry is obtained by using (3.7) (and not by adding trace with ordinary path ordering to (3.9)).

This 1-d supersymmetric theory defined by (3.2),(3.9)

$$Z[\mathcal{T}, A] = \int d^D x \ e^{-W} \ , \qquad e^{-W} = < e^{-I[x+\xi,\psi]} > \ , \tag{3.10}$$

$$< ... >= \int [d\xi][d\psi] e^{-\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\int(\xi G^{-1}\xi + \psi K^{-1}\psi)} \ ,$$

has only logarithmic UV divergences, i.e. all power divergences cancel out [47,27]. This is true in the general non-abelian case, and also in the presence of supersymmetric higher-derivative interactions, and is implied, e.g., by the non-local form of the 1-d supersymmetric lowest-dimension interaction in (3.7),(3.9).

In particular, there is no inhomogeneous F-dependent term (2.13) in the analog of (2.10). Indeed, the coefficient in the analog of (2.14) (i.e. in Z computed for $F_{mn} = \text{const}$) now has both bosonic and fermionic contributions and is finite as a result [47]:

$$b_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\epsilon n} - \sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty} e^{-2\epsilon r} = -\tfrac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon) \ . \tag{3.11}$$

This cancellation of power divergences makes the NSR string partition function $Z[A, \mathcal{T}, ...]$ much better defined than in the bosonic string case.

One consequence is that the tachyon field manifestly decouples from the massless vector sector. This follows of course from conservation of G-parity ($\psi^m \to -\psi^m, \ \theta \to -\theta$) under which the tachyonic vertex is odd, while the vector vertex is even. In the S-matrix language, there are no tachyonic poles in the massless NS vector amplitudes (so that the theory has of course consistent superstring truncation). Equivalently, this is obvious from (3.9) where $\mathcal{T}$ appears only quadratically.

As a result, the subtleties like the one discussed in section 2.2 do not appear in the NSR case, and the renormalized partition function $Z[A_{\rm R}, \mathcal{T}_R = 0]$ gives directly the vector field effective action consistent with the string S-matrix and β^A-function [27] (renormalization of logarithmic divergences corresponding to subtraction of massless poles in the string amplitudes is still needed in order to define the effective action). For example, it was demonstrated in [27] that the leading derivative correction to the BI term in the partition function Z (3.10),(3.9) which has the structure $F^2(\partial\partial F)^2$ is exactly the same as in the action reconstructed from the 4-point NSR string vector amplitude.

3.2. Tachyon action and correspondence with β-function

Let us compute the leading $\mathcal{T}$-dependent terms in the abelian partition function (3.10) using derivative expansion. Expanding in powers of the quantum fields ξ, ψ one finds

$$I = \tfrac{1}{4} \int d\varphi \Big[\mathcal{T}^2(x+\xi) - [\psi^m \partial_m \mathcal{T}(x+\xi)] \partial_\varphi^{-1} [\psi^n \partial_n \mathcal{T}(x+\xi)] \Big]$$

$$= \tfrac{1}{4} \int d\varphi \Big[\mathcal{T}^2 + (\mathcal{T}\partial_m\partial_n\mathcal{T} + \partial_m\mathcal{T}\partial_n\mathcal{T})\xi^m\xi^n - \psi^m\partial_m\mathcal{T}\partial_\varphi^{-1}\psi^n\partial_n\mathcal{T} + O(\xi^3, \psi^2\xi) \Big] \ . \tag{3.12}$$

The leading one-loop contribution to (3.9) is thus ($2\pi\alpha' = 1$)

$$W = \tfrac{\pi}{2}(\mathcal{T}^2 + s_1\mathcal{T}\partial^2\mathcal{T} + s_2\partial_m\mathcal{T}\partial_m\mathcal{T}) + O(\partial^4) \ , \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$s_1 = G(\varphi,\varphi) = \tfrac{1}{\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon n}}{n} = -\tfrac{1}{\pi}\ln\epsilon + O(\epsilon)\ , \tag{3.14}$$

$$s_2 = (G + K\cdot\partial_\varphi^{-1})(\varphi,\varphi) = \tfrac{1}{\pi}(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon n}}{n} - \sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon r}}{r}) = -\tfrac{1}{\pi}\ln 4 + O(\epsilon)\ . \tag{3.15}$$

[The exact expressions for the sums are [27]:
$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon n}}{n} = -\ln(1-e^{-\epsilon})\ ,\ \ \sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\epsilon r}}{r} = -\ln(\frac{1-e^{-\epsilon/2}}{1+e^{-\epsilon/2}})$.]

Thus while the coefficient of $\partial\mathcal{T}\partial\mathcal{T}$ term is finite [22] (it may probably depend on a regularization only if the latter breaks 1-d supersymmetry, cf. [36]), the coefficient of $\mathcal{T}\partial^2\mathcal{T}$ term is logarithmically divergent. This divergence is to be renormalized by absorbing it into $\mathcal{T}$. Just as in the bosonic case, this logarithmic divergence determines the derivative term in the tachyon β-function. The coefficient of the logarithmic pole (i.e. the anomalous dimension of the tachyon vertex operator) is of course the same as in the bosonic case, but the dimension of the NS tachyon vertex is half of the bosonic one ($\mathcal{T}\sim\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$). Thus (cf. (2.18))

$$\beta^{\mathcal{T}} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{T} - \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\partial^2\mathcal{T}\ . \tag{3.16}$$

Introducing a constant F_{mn} background means replacing G by $G(F)$ in (2.7) and K in (3.2) by $K(F)$ [48,27]

$$K^{mn}(\varphi_1,\varphi_2|F) = \ \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{r=1/2}^{\infty} e^{-\epsilon r}\left[\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\sin r\varphi_{12} + i\mathcal{H}^{mn}(F)\cos r\varphi_{12}\right]\ . \tag{3.17}$$

Then one finds again (3.13) but with the flat target space metric replaced by $\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)$ in (2.8). In particular, then (3.16) takes the form (see also [36])

$$\beta^{\mathcal{T}} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{T} - \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\mathcal{G}^{mn}(F)\partial_m\partial_n\mathcal{T}\ . \tag{3.18}$$

Ignoring first the F_{mn} background and expanding e^{-W} in derivatives of the tachyon field we obtain the renormalized value of the partition function in (3.10). To simplify the expression let us define the renormalized value of the tachyon T by rescaling $\mathcal{T}$ by $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}$. Then

$$Z[T] = c_0\int d^Dx\ e^{-T^2}\ \left[1 - \bar{s}_1 T\partial^2 T - s_2(\partial T)^2 + O(\partial^4 T)\right]\ , \tag{3.19}$$

where $\bar{s}_1$ stands for a renormalized value of s_1 in (3.14). The same expression, but without the $\bar{s}_1$ term was found in [22] where T was taken to be linear in x^m (i.e. $\partial^2 T$ was equal to zero).

It is natural to expect that in contrast to the bosonic string case where one needs to shift Z by a derivative term [23,24] to get the action (2.19) reproducing the tachyon beta function, in the NSR string case the (renormalized) partition function is itself the correct action, not only in the massless vector sector [27] but also in the tachyonic one [22]. To demonstrate that $S[T] = Z[T]$ (3.19) does indeed reproduce both terms in the perturbative β-function (3.16) it is crucial to include the $\bar{s}_1$ term in (3.19). The two derivative-dependent terms in (3.19) are closely related through integration by parts (cf. (2.24))

$$S[T] = Z[T] = c_0 \int d^D x \ e^{-T^2} \Big[1 + c_1 \alpha' (\partial T)^2 + c_2 \alpha' T^2 (\partial T)^2 + O(\partial^4 T) \Big] \ , \tag{3.20}$$

$$c_1 = 2\pi (\bar{s}_1 - s_2) \ , \qquad c_2 = -4\pi \bar{s}_1 \ . \tag{3.21}$$

Since s_1 was logarithmically divergent before renormalization, its renormalized value $\bar{s}_1$ is, in principle, ambiguous and, as in the bosonic case (see (2.24)–(2.27)) can be tuned to match the variation of $S[T]$ with the β^T-function in (3.16). Indeed, we find

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta T} = 2 \ c_0 \ e^{-T^2} \Big[- T - c_1 \alpha' \partial^2 T$$

$$- \ c_2 \alpha' T^2 \partial^2 T + (c_1 - c_2) \alpha' T (\partial T)^2 + c_2 \alpha' T^3 (\partial T)^2 + O(\alpha'^2 \partial^4 T) \Big] \ . \tag{3.22}$$

Thus the linear terms here are proportional to (3.16) if $\bar{s}_1 = \frac{1}{\pi}(1 - \ln 4)$, i.e. if

$$c_1 = 2 \ . \tag{3.23}$$

Then $c_2 = 4(\ln 4 - 1) > 0$ so that the kinetic term in (3.20) is positive for all T.

While it may seem making little sense to try to reproduce the correct tachyonic mass plus kinetic terms in the action using the perturbative derivative expansion, the point is that the freedom of field redefinitions allows one to do that, both in the bosonic [20,49] and in the NSR cases. The resulting field space "metric" κ is then simplest in such scheme.

The generalization of the action (3.20) to the presence of a $F_{mn} =$ const background is straightforward (cf. (2.29)) (the partition function for $\partial_m T =$ const, $F_{mn} =$ const background was computed in [36]; its expansion in ∂T reproduces part of the c_1 term in the expression below which corresponds to the s_2 term in (3.19))

$$S = c_0 \int d^D x \ e^{-T^2} \sqrt{\det(\delta_{mn} + 2\pi\alpha' F_{mn})} \ \Big[\ 1 + \ c_1 \alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(2\pi\alpha' F) \ \partial_m T \partial_n T$$

$$+ \ c_2 \alpha' \mathcal{G}^{mn}(2\pi\alpha' F) \ T^2 \partial_m T \partial_n T \ + \ O(\alpha'^2 \partial^4 T, \alpha'^2 \partial^2 F) \Big] \ , \tag{3.24}$$

where we restored the dependence on α'. This action is consistent with (3.18) for $c_1 = 2$.

The non-abelian generalization of (3.24) may be obtained, in principle, from the gauge-invariant path integral defined by (3.7).

4. Closed string theories

In bosonic closed string case we start with the sigma model [2] (for simplicity, we shall ignore the Kalb-Ramond antisymmetric tensor coupling which is not essential for the present discussion and can be easily included)

$$I = \int d^2 z \sqrt{g} \Big[\epsilon^{-2} T_0(x) + \tfrac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \partial^\mu x^m \partial_\mu x^n G_{mn}(x) + \tfrac{1}{4\pi} R^{(2)} \phi(x) \Big] \ . \tag{4.1}$$

This model is renormalizable within α' expansion. The corresponding bare partition function on 2-sphere has the form [2]

$$Z[T_0(\epsilon), G(\epsilon), \phi(\epsilon), \epsilon] = d_0 \int d^D x \ \sqrt{G} \ e^{-2\phi - \epsilon^{-2} A T_0} \ e^{-W} \ , \tag{4.2}$$

where we shifted $x(z) \to x + \xi(z)$ so that (as in (2.4)) W is given by the path integral over the non-constant fluctuations ξ (see [2,10,29] for details). The coefficient A is the area of S^2 with fiducial 2-d metric (it can be absorbed into the renormalized value of T_0). The leading logarithmically divergent terms in W are found to be [4,2]

$$W = \tfrac{1}{2} \gamma \ln \epsilon + O(\ln^2 \epsilon) + \text{finite} \ ,$$

$$\gamma = \mathrm{c}_0 - \alpha' \mathcal{D}^2 (\epsilon^{-2} A T_0) - 2\alpha' \mathcal{D}^2 \phi - \alpha' R + O(\alpha'^2) \ , \qquad \mathrm{c}_0 = \tfrac{2}{3}(D - 26) \ . \tag{4.3}$$

For example, taking the derivative of Z over ϵ reproduces the standard perturbative closed string tachyon β-function,

$$\beta^T = -2T - \tfrac{1}{2} \alpha' \mathcal{D}^2 T \ , \tag{4.4}$$

with the corresponding Weyl anomaly coefficient being $\bar{\beta}^T = \beta^T + \alpha' \partial^m \phi \partial_m T$.

To obtain the effective action for the massless fields $S[G, \phi]$ from the partition function Z one should, as in the open string case, renormalize the logarithmic infinities which corresponds to subtracting massless poles in the string amplitudes [10]. An additional subtlety of the closed string case is that the Möbius group volume has logarithmic divergence, and it should be subtracted, in the RG invariant way, by applying $\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln \epsilon}$ to the bare value of Z [28]. To compare the formal generating functional Z to massless effective action reconstructed from string amplitudes one needs to subtract both Möbius infinities and massless poles (UV logarithms). While the former are power-like in the open string case, they are also logarithmic in the closed string case. That means that "extra" log should be subtracted from Z in the closed string case.

Expressed in terms of renormalized couplings, the effective action is then [28] ($\lambda^i = (T, G, \phi)$)

$$S = -(\frac{\partial Z}{\partial \ln \epsilon})_{\epsilon=1} = \beta^i \cdot \frac{\delta Z}{\delta \lambda^i} \ . \tag{4.5}$$

Because of the diffeomorphism invariance, the expression for S can be written also as $S = \bar{\beta}^i \cdot \frac{\delta Z}{\delta \lambda^i}$, where $\bar{\beta}^i = \beta^i + (\delta \lambda^i)_{\alpha' \partial \phi}$ (i.e. $\bar{\beta}^\phi = \beta^\phi + \alpha' \partial^m \phi \partial_m \phi, \ \ \bar{\beta}^G_{mn} = \beta^G_{mn} + 2\alpha' \mathcal{D}_m \mathcal{D}_n \phi$, etc.) are the Weyl anomaly coefficients, the vanishing of which should be equivalent to the conditions of stationarity of the action.

Explicitly,

$$S = \int d^D x \ \sqrt{G} \ e^{-2\phi - T} \ (-2T + \tfrac{1}{2}\gamma)$$

$$= \int d^D x \ \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi - T} \Big[\tfrac{1}{2} \mathrm{c}_0 - 2T - \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' \mathcal{D}^2 T - \alpha' \mathcal{D}^2 \phi - \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' R + O(\alpha'^2) \Big] \ , \tag{4.6}$$

where T is a renormalized value of the tachyon rescaled by A. Equivalently,

$$S = \int d^D x \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi - T} \big(\beta^T + 2\beta^\phi - \tfrac{1}{2} G^{mn} \beta^G_{mn} \big)$$

$$= \int d^D x \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi - T} \big(\bar{\beta}^T + 2\bar{\beta}^\phi - \tfrac{1}{2} G^{mn} \bar{\beta}^G_{mn} \big), \tag{4.7}$$

i.e.

$$S = -(\frac{d}{d \ln \epsilon} \mathcal{Z})_{\epsilon=1} \ , \qquad \mathcal{Z} = \int d^D x \ \sqrt{G} \ e^{-2\phi - T} \ . \tag{4.8}$$

Note that (in contrast to the open string case (2.15),(2.16)) the coefficients of derivative terms here are scheme-independent. Setting the tachyon to zero (and integrating by parts) we get the standard closed string effective action consistent with S-matrix [1] and massless β-functions [50,7]

$$S = -\tfrac{1}{2} \int d^D x \ \sqrt{G} \ e^{-2\phi} \Big[-\mathrm{c}_0 + 4\alpha' (\partial \phi)^2 + \alpha' R + O(\alpha'^2) \Big] \ . \tag{4.9}$$

As discussed in [28], the definition (4.5) in general leads to S given by the space-time integral of the "central charge" coefficient.

The functional (4.6) is not, however, the right action for $T \neq 0$: it does not have the standard perturbative vacuum ($D = 26, T = 0, \phi = \text{const}, G_{mn} = \delta_{mn}$) as its stationary point (equivalently, the tachyon tadpole on 2-sphere does not vanish even after taking the derivative in (4.5)). Another indication of a problem in (4.6) is that one can almost completely absorb T into the dilaton: introducing $\tilde{\phi} = \phi + \frac{1}{2} T$ one is left with only a linear term in T. Futhermore, the kinetic term of T in (4.6) ($-\frac{1}{2}\alpha' \partial^m T \partial_m T$ after integration by parts) has apparently the "wrong" sign. We use the Euclidean signature so the correct sign for a scalar kinetic term is plus. This is the sign of the dilaton kinetic term in (4.6) after redefining the metric to decouple graviton from dilaton (i.e. after going to the Einstein frame). In general, T and ϕ and the graviton are mixed, so that their kinetic matrix is to be diagonalized before discussing the signs (see below).

As in the open string case, to try to find a consistent action that reproduces $\bar{\beta}^i = 0$ conditions for all the three fields one is thus to subtract the tachyon tadpole in an RG invariant way. By analogy with (2.19), let us define

$$\hat{S} = S + \tfrac{1}{2}\beta^i \cdot \frac{\delta S}{\delta\lambda^i} = \beta^i \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta\lambda^i} Z + \tfrac{1}{2}\beta^j \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta\lambda^j}(\beta^i \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta\lambda^i} Z) \ . \tag{4.10}$$

The coefficient 1/2 accounts for the factor of two difference in dimensions of the open and closed strings tachyons, cf. (2.18),(4.4). Note that since S in (4.5) is RG invariant ($\frac{d}{d\ln\epsilon}Z = 0 \to \frac{d}{d\ln\epsilon}\frac{\partial}{\partial\ln\epsilon}Z = 0$), the same applies to each of the two terms in $\hat{S}$.

Expanding near the standard flat string vacuum ($D = 26,\ G_{mn} = \text{const},\ \phi = \text{const}$) one is to keep the dilaton and graviton perturbations in $\hat{S}$ and consistently decouple them from T by field redefinitions (we are grateful to S. Frolov for an important discussion of this point). Observing that for small perturbations near the flat vacuum $\beta^\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha'\partial^2\phi,\ \beta^G_{mn} = \alpha' R_{mn}$, one finds

$$\hat{S} = S + \tfrac{1}{2}(\beta^T \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta T} + \beta^\phi \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta\phi} + \beta^G_{mn} \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta G_{mn}})S$$

$$= \int d^D x\ \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi - T}\Big[-2T^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha'\mathcal{D}^2 T - \alpha' T\mathcal{D}^2 T - \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha'(1+2T)(R + 2\mathcal{D}^2\phi) + O(\alpha'^2)\Big] \ . \tag{4.11}$$

This action no longer has a tadpole T-term (cf. (4.6)), but to decouple graviton from scalars we still need, as usual, to redefine the metric. Ignoring "mixed" (tachyon–massless) terms which are of higher than quadratic order in the fields we can approximately replace $e^{-2\phi-T}(1+2T)$ factor in front of R by $e^{-2\varphi}$, $\varphi \equiv \phi - \frac{1}{2}T$ and set $G_{mn} = e^{\frac{4\varphi}{D-2}} g_{mn}$. Then $\int d^D x \sqrt{G} e^{-2\phi-T}(1+2T)(R + 2\mathcal{D}^2\phi) \ \to \ \int d^D x \sqrt{g}\big[R(g) - \frac{4}{D-2}(\partial\varphi)^2 + 2\partial^m T \partial_m \varphi\big]$. As a result, the action (4.11) takes the form

$$\hat{S} = \int d^D x\ \sqrt{g}\ \Big(e^{-2T}\big[-2T^2 e^{\frac{4\varphi}{D-2}} + 2\alpha'(1-T)(\partial T)^2\big] - \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha'\big[R(g) - \tfrac{4}{D-2}(\partial\varphi)^2\big] + O(\alpha'^2)\Big) \ . \tag{4.12}$$

If one does the exact redefinition $(1+2T)e^{-2\phi-T} = e^{-2\psi}$, i.e. $\psi = \phi + \frac{1}{2}T - \frac{1}{2}\ln(1+2T)$, and thus $G_{mn} = e^{\frac{4\psi}{D-2}} g_{mn}$, then one finds the following action

$$\hat{S} = \int d^D x \, \sqrt{g} \, \Big(- \frac{2T^2}{1+2T} e^{\frac{4\psi}{D-2}} + \frac{2\alpha'}{(1+2T)^2} (\partial T)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\alpha' \big[R(g) - \tfrac{4}{D-2} (\partial\psi)^2 \big] + O(\alpha'^2) \Big) \ .$$

which is equivalent to the one above in the quadratic order in T. Introducing $\tilde{T} = \frac{1}{2}\ln(1+2T)$ (assuming $T > -\frac{1}{2}$) its tachyonic part becomes simply $\hat{S} = \int d^D x \ \big[-2\sinh^2 \tilde{T} + 2\alpha' (\partial\tilde{T})^2 \big]$.

Ignoring the graviton and dilaton terms (decoupled to quadratic order in fluctuations) the tachyon part of the action is thus

$$\hat{S} = \int d^D x \ e^{-2T} \ \big[-2T^2 + 2\alpha'(1-T)(\partial T)^2 + O(\alpha'^2) \big] \ . \tag{4.13}$$

This action has a structure similar to (2.24), but the value of the coefficient of the second kinetic term, though now positive, is not the one needed to reproduce the β^T-function (4.4). It may be that the definition (4.10) still needs some further refinement.

The potential term in (4.13) $V = -2e^{-2T}T^2$ has tachyonic maximum at $T = 0$ and the stable minimum at $T = 1$. However, that minimum is not reached as the kinetic term of T changes sign at $T = 1$. In general, in discussing the vacuum structure one should take into account a non-trivial mixing of the tachyon with the dilaton and the metric. For example, for linear dilaton and $D = 2$ the tachyon should be massless (as follows from $\bar{\beta}^T = 0$), and in this case one should expect to find no potential term.

The exponential potential in (4.13) may be suggesting (by analogy with the open string case) a possibility of T rolling to infinity along some directions, and such behavior should be accompaneed by a non-constant dilaton to preserve the central charge condition (see also [16] for related remarks).

In the closed NSR string case the tachyon vertex has the following form (in the 0-ghost picture) $\int d^2 z \ \psi^m \bar{\psi}^n \partial_m \partial_n T$. Its 2-d supersymmetric generalization is $\int d^2 z d^2\theta \ T(\hat{x})$, where $\hat{x}^m = x^m + \theta\psi^m + \bar{\theta}\bar{\psi}^m + \bar{\theta}\theta f^m$. Combined with the kinetic term $\int d^2 z d^2\theta \ D\hat{x}^m \bar{D}\hat{x}^m$ it leads, after the elimination of the auxiliary field f^m, to the following tachyon terms in the sigma model action (which are the familiar superpotential terms in $N = 1$ supersymmetric scalar 2-d field theory, cf. also (3.9))

$$\int d^2 z \big[\partial^m T(x) \partial_m T(x) + \psi^m \bar{\psi}^n \partial_m \partial_n T(x) \big] \ . \tag{4.14}$$

As in the open NSR string case, the resulting partition function and thus the effective action (4.5) it generates are even in T. As a result, there is no need for an additional subtraction like (4.10). Since the sigma model depends on T only through its derivatives, there is no tachyon potential term in S.

The leading T-dependent logarithmic divergence in Z comes from the expansion of $\partial_m T \partial^m T$ term in (4.14) and corresponds to the β-function $(-1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha' \mathcal{D}^2)T$. The leading G_{mn} and ϕ-dependent terms in Z and S in the NSR case are the same as in the bosonic case [51] (with the obvious replacement of c_0 in (4.3) by $D - 10$). While the NS-NS part of the effective action generated by the sigma model appears to depend on T only through its derivatives, functions of T may still be present in the R-R sector (where one is to use the ghost -1 tachyon vertex [52]).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to O. Andreev, S. Frolov, D. Kutasov and S. Shatashvili for useful discussions and remarks. This work was supported in part by the DOE grant DE-FG02-91ER40690, INTAS grant No. 99-0590 and PPARC SPG grant PPA/G/S/1998/00613.

References

[1] J. Scherk, “Zero slope limit of the dual resonance model”, Nucl. Phys. **B31**, 222 (1971). A. Neveu and J. Scherk, “Connection Between Yang-Mills Fields And Dual Models,” Nucl. Phys. **B36**, 155 (1972). J. Scherk and J.H. Schwarz, “Dual Models For Nonhadrons,” Nucl. Phys. **B81**, 118 (1974). T. Yoneya, “Connection Of Dual Models To Electrodynamics And Gravidynamics,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **51**, 1907 (1974).

[2] E.S. Fradkin and A.A. Tseytlin, “Quantum String Theory Effective Action,” Nucl. Phys. **B261** (1985) 1. “Effective Field Theory From Quantized Strings,” Phys. Lett. **B158**, 316 (1985).

[3] C.S. Hsue, B. Sakita and M.A. Virasoro, “Formulation of dual theory in terms of functional integrations,” Phys. Rev. **D2**, 2857 (1970). M. Ademollo, A. D’Adda, R. D’Auria, E. Napolitano, S. Sciuto, P. Di Vecchia, F. Gliozzi, R. Musto, F. Nicodemi, “Theory Of An Interacting String And Dual Resonance Model,” Nuovo Cim. **21A**, 77 (1974).

[4] A.M. Polyakov, “Quantum geometry of bosonic strings,” Phys. Lett. **B103**, 207 (1981).

[5] A.A. Tseytlin, “Sigma Model Approach To String Theory,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4**, 1257 (1989). “Renormalization Group And String Loops,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A5**, 589 (1990).

[6] C. Lovelace, “Stability Of String Vacua. 1. A New Picture Of The Renormalization Group,” Nucl. Phys. **B273**, 413 (1986).

[7] C.G. Callan, E.J. Martinec, M.J. Perry and D. Friedan, “Strings In Background Fields,” Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 593 (1985). C.G. Callan and Z. Gan, “Vertex Operators In Background Fields,” Nucl. Phys. **B272**, 647 (1986).

[8] A.B. Zamolodchikov, “’Irreversibility’ Of The Flux Of The Renormalization Group In A 2-D Field Theory,” JETP Lett. **43**, 730 (1986).

[9] A.M. Polyakov, “Directions In String Theory,” Phys. Scripta **T15** (1987) 191.

[10] A.A. Tseytlin, “Vector Field Effective Action In The Open Superstring Theory,” Nucl. Phys. **B276**, 391 (1986).

[11] E.S. Fradkin and A.A. Tseytlin, “Nonlinear Electrodynamics From Quantized Strings,” Phys. Lett. **B163**, 123 (1985).

[12] S.R. Das and B. Sathiapalan, “String Propagation In A Tachyon Background,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2664 (1986); “New Infinities In Two-Dimensional Nonlinear Sigma Models And Consistent String Propagation,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1511 (1986). R. Akhoury and Y. Okada, “Unitarity Constraints For String Propagation In The Presence Of Background Fields,” Phys. Lett. **B183**, 65 (1987). C. Itoi and Y. Watabiki, “Nonperturbative Effect In The Beta Functions And The Equations Of Motion For String,” Phys. Lett. **B198**, 486 (1987). Y. Watabiki, “Weyl Anomaly Of The Product Of String

Vertex Functions," Z. Phys. **C38**, 411 (1988). H. Ooguri and N. Sakai, "String Loop Corrections From Fusion Of Handles And Vertex Operators," Phys. Lett. **B197**, 109 (1987). R. Brustein, D. Nemeschansky and S. Yankielowicz, "Beta Functions And S Matrix In String Theory," Nucl. Phys. **B301**, 224 (1988). I. Klebanov and L. Susskind, "Renormalization Group And String Amplitudes," Phys. Lett. **B200**, 446 (1988). S. Elitzur, A. Forge and E. Rabinovici, "Some global aspects of string compactifications," Nucl. Phys. **B359**, 581 (1991). A.R. Cooper, L. Susskind and L. Thorlacius, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 132 (1991). J. Schnittger and U. Ellwanger, "Nonperturbative conditions for local Weyl invariance on a curved world sheet," Theor. Math. Phys. **95**, 643 (1993), hep-th/9211139. V.A. Kostelecky, M. Perry and R. Potting, "Off-shell structure of the string sigma model," Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4541 (2000), hep-th/9912243.

[13] A.A. Tseytlin, "On the tachyonic terms in the string effective action," Phys. Lett. **B264**, 311 (1991).

[14] T. Banks, "The Tachyon potential in string theory," Nucl. Phys. **B361**, 166 (1991).

[15] A. Sen, "Non-BPS states and branes in string theory," hep-th/9904207.

[16] J.A. Harvey, D. Kutasov and E. Martinec, "On the relevance of tachyons," hep-th/0003101.

[17] J.A. Minahan and B. Zwiebach, "Field theory models for tachyon and gauge field string dynamics," JHEP **0009**, 029 (2000), hep-th/0008231; "Effective tachyon dynamics in superstring theory," hep-th/0009246.

[18] S. Dasgupta and T. Dasgupta, "Renormalization group analysis of tachyon condensation," hep-th/0010247.

[19] K. Bardakci, "Dual Models and Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking", Nucl. Phys. **B68**, 331 (1974). K. Bardakci and M.B. Halpern, "Explicit Spontaneous Breakdown in a Dual Model", Phys. Rev. **D10**, 4230 (1974); "Explicit Spontaneous Breakdown in a Dual Model II: N Point Functions", Nucl. Phys. **B96**, 285 (1975). K.Bardakci, "Spontaneous Symmetry Breakdown in the Standard Dual String Model", Nucl. Phys. **B133**, 297 (1978).

[20] A. Gerasimov and S. Shatashvili, "On exact tachyon potential in open string field theory," JHEP **0010**, 034 (2000), hep-th/0009103.

[21] D. Kutasov, M. Mariño, and G. Moore, "Some exact results on tachyon condensation in string field theory," hep-th/0009148.

[22] D. Kutasov, M. Mariño and G. Moore, "Remarks on tachyon condensation in superstring field theory," hep-th/0010108.

[23] E. Witten, "On background-independent open-string field theory," Phys. Rev. **D46**, 5467 (1992), hep-th/9208027. "Some computations in background-independent off-shell string theory," Phys. Rev. **D47**, 3405 (1993), hep-th/9210065.

[24] S. Shatashvili, “Comment on the background independent open string theory,” Phys. Lett. **B311**, 83 (1993), hep-th/9303143; “On the problems with background independence in string theory,” hep-th/9311177.

[25] A.A. Tseytlin, “Renormalization Of Mobius Infinities And Partition Function Representation For String Theory Effective Action,” Phys. Lett. **B202**, 81 (1988).

[26] B.E. Fridling and A. Jevicki, “Nonlinear Sigma Models As S Matrix Generating Functionals Of Strings,” Phys. Lett. **B174**, 75 (1986).

[27] O.D. Andreev and A.A. Tseytlin, “Partition Function Representation For The Open Superstring Effective Action: Cancellation Of Mobius Infinities And Derivative Corrections To Born-Infeld Lagrangian,” Nucl. Phys. **B311**, 205 (1988).

[28] A.A. Tseytlin, “Mobius Infinity Subtraction And Effective Action In Sigma Model Approach To Closed String Theory,” Phys. Lett. **B208**, 221 (1988). “Conditions Of Weyl Invariance Of Two-Dimensional Sigma Model From Equations Of Stationarity Of 'Central Charge' Action,” Phys. Lett. **B194**, 63 (1987).

[29] A.A. Tseytlin, “Partition Function Of String Sigma Model On A Compact Two Space,” Phys. Lett. **B223**, 165 (1989).

[30] I. Affleck and A.W. Ludwig,“Universal noninteger 'ground state degeneracy' in critical quantum systems,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 161 (1991).

[31] S. Samuel, “Color Zitterbewegung,” Nucl. Phys. **B149**, 517 (1979). J. Ishida and A. Hosoya, “Path Integral For A Color Spin And Path Ordered Phase Factor,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **62**, 544 (1979). A. Barducci, R. Casalbuoni and L. Lusanna, “Anticommuting Variables, Internal Degrees Of Freedom, And The Wilson Loop,” Nucl. Phys. **B180**, 141 (1981). J.L. Gervais and A. Neveu, “The Slope Of The Leading Regge Trajectory In Quantum Chromodynamics,” Nucl. Phys. **B163**, 189 (1980). H. Dorn, “Renormalization Of Path Ordered Phase Factors And Related Hadron Operators In Gauge Field Theories,” Fortsch. Phys. **34**, 11 (1986).

[32] A.A. Tseytlin, “Born-Infeld action, supersymmetry and string theory,” hep-th/9908105.

[33] K. Li and E. Witten, “Role of short distance behavior in off-shell open-string field theory,” Phys. Rev. **D48**, 853 (1993), hep-th/9303067.

[34] K. Okuyama, “Noncommutative Tachyon from Background Independent Open String Field Theory,” hep-th/0010028.

[35] L. Cornalba, “Tachyon condensation in large magnetic fields with background independent string field theory,” hep-th/0010021.

[36] O. Andreev, “Some computations of partition functions and tachyon potentials in background independent off-shell string theory,” hep-th/0010218.

[37] A. Abouelsaood, C.G. Callan, C.R. Nappi and S.A. Yost, “Open Strings In Background Gauge Fields,” Nucl. Phys. **B280**, 599 (1987).

[38] H. Dorn and H.J. Otto, “Open Bosonic Strings In General Background Fields,” Z. Phys. **C32**, 599 (1986).

[39] A.A. Tseytlin, “Ambiguity In The Effective Action In String Theories,” Phys. Lett. **B176**, 92 (1986).

[40] D.J. Gross and E. Witten, “Superstring Modifications Of Einstein’s Equations,” Nucl. Phys. **B277**, 1 (1986).

[41] O.D. Andreev and A.A. Tseytlin, “Two Loop Beta Function In The Open String Sigma Model And Equivalence With String Effective Equations Of Motion,” Mod. Phys. Lett. **A3**, 1349 (1988).

[42] O.D. Andreev and A.A. Tseytlin, “Generating Functional For Scattering Amplitudes And Effective Action In The Open Superstring Theory,” Phys. Lett. **B207**, 157 (1988).

[43] A. Neveu and J.H. Schwarz, “Factorizable Dual Model Of Pions,” Nucl. Phys. **B31**, 86 (1971).

[44] E. Witten, “D-branes and K-theory,” JHEP **9812**, 019 (1998), hep-th/9810188.

[45] M.B. Green and N. Seiberg, “Contact Interactions In Superstring Theory,” Nucl. Phys. **B299**, 559 (1988). M. Dine and N. Seiberg, “Microscopic Knowledge From Macroscopic Physics In String Theory,” Nucl. Phys. **B301**, 357 (1988).

[46] L. Alvarez-Gaume, “Supersymmetry And The Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem,” Commun. Math. Phys. **90**, 161 (1983). D. Friedan and P. Windey, “Supersymmetric Derivation Of The Atiyah-Singer Index And The Chiral Anomaly,” Nucl. Phys. **B235**, 395 (1984).

[47] R.R. Metsaev, M.A. Rakhmanov and A.A. Tseytlin, “The Born-Infeld Action As The Effective Action In The Open Superstring Theory,” Phys. Lett. **B193**, 207 (1987).

[48] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin, C.N. Pope and P.K. Townsend, “The Born-Infeld Action From Conformal Invariance Of The Open Superstring,” Phys. Lett. **188B**, 70 (1987).

[49] A.A. Gerasimov and S.L. Shatashvili, “Stringy Higgs Mechanism and the Fate of Open Strings,” hep-th/0011009.

[50] J. Honerkamp and G. Ecker, “Application of invariant renormalization to the nonlinear chiral invariant pion lagrangian in the one-loop approximation”, Nucl. Phys. **B35**, 481 (1971). J. Honerkamp, “Chiral multi-loops”, Nucl. Phys. **B36**, 130 (1972). D.H. Friedan, “Nonlinear Models In Two + Epsilon Dimensions,” Annals Phys. **163**, 318 (1985).

[51] O.D. Andreev, R.R. Metsaev and A.A. Tseytlin, “Covariant calculation of the partition function of the two-dimensional sigma model on compact 2-surfaces,” Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **51**, 359 (1990).

[52] I.R. Klebanov and A.A. Tseytlin, “D-branes and dual gauge theories in type 0 strings,” Nucl. Phys. **B546**, 155 (1999), hep-th/9811035.